

REMARKS

The Examiner has objected to Claim 6. Such objection has been avoided by virtue of the clarifications made to such claim hereinabove.

Moreover, the Examiner has rejected Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 has been avoided by virtue of the clarifications made to such claim hereinabove.

Still yet, the Examiner has rejected Claims 19 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. 101, because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. This rejection has been avoided by virtue of the clarifications made to such claims hereinabove.

The Examiner has further rejected Claims 1-4, 6, 7, and 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dick et al. (2002/0174340) in view of Schlossberg et al. (2002/0066034). Applicant respectfully disagrees with such rejection, especially in view of the amendments made hereinabove.

Specifically, the Examiner relies on the excerpts below from Dick to make a prior art showing of applicant's claimed "organizing a plurality of types of events associated with a firewall of a local computer" (see this and similar language in each of the independent claims).

"[0064] There are a number of firewall screening methods. A simple one is to screen requests to make sure they come from acceptable (previously identified) domain name and Internet Protocol (IP) addresses. For mobile users, firewalls allow remote access in to the private network by the use of secure logon procedures

NAIIP093\_02.012.01

-11-

and authentication certificates.

[0065] Common features of firewall include logging and reporting, automatic alarms at given thresholds of attack, and a graphical user interface for controlling the firewall."

Such excerpt, however, merely makes a general suggestion of "logging," "reporting," and "thresholds," etc. There is simply no disclosure, teaching, or even a suggestion in such excerpt and the remaining Dick reference of any sort of "organizing a plurality of types of events associated with a firewall of a local computer" (emphasis added). Only applicant teaches and claims such organization of the specifically claimed events.

Despite this clear distinction and in the spirit of expediting the prosecution of the present application, applicant has substantially incorporated the subject matter of Claims 13-18 and 25-26, as well as additional supported claim language, into each of the independent claims. Thus, applicant now claims in each of the independent claims the following limitations (or substantially similar language):

- "wherein the graphical representation includes a graph;
- wherein a selector is displayed for setting a blocking level of the firewall to a desired blocking level;
- wherein a plurality of interface features are displayed including a summary interface, an Internet protocol (IP) address interface, an event log, and a notification option interface, wherein:
  - upon the selection of the summary interface, displaying a recent activity list including total blocked access attempts by remote computers,

upon the selection of the IP address interface, displaying the IP address interface for selecting the IP addresses associated with the remote computers to be blocked,  
upon the selection of the event log, displaying a log of the blocked access attempts by the remote computers, and  
upon the selection of the notification option interface, displaying a plurality of notification options for selection;  
wherein a lock-down option is provided for selectively blocking all access attempts via an interface;  
wherein a user is capable of performing a visual trace;  
wherein the user is capable of selectively blocking Internet control message protocol (ICMP) traffic;  
wherein the user is capable of selecting the IP addresses associated with the remote computers to be allowed access;  
wherein the user is capable of selecting a list of application programs to be allowed to communicate over a network.”

A notice of allowance or a specific prior art showing of each of the foregoing features, in combination with the remaining claim elements, is respectfully requested.

It is noted that the Examiner has rejected the subject matter of Claims 13, 15, 16, 18, and 22-26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dick et al., Schlossberg et al., and Fournel. During the course of such rejection, the Examiner has admitted that such references fail to specifically suggest any sort of summary pages or pages for specific types of illicit access attempts. The Examiner further invokes Official Notice that it is old and well-known to provide graphical user interfaces that give different viewing options for data, etc.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with such assertion, since applicant's specifically claimed organization provides for an improved user experience in the specific context of a firewall. Moreover, even if the Examiner's assertion above is true, the Examiner has not taken into full consideration applicant's claim elements. For example, applicant claims much more than "graphical user interfaces that give different viewing options for data," etc.

It thus appears that the Examiner has simply dismissed applicant's claim limitations under Official Notice. In response, applicant again points out the remarks above that clearly show the manner in which some of such claimed features further distinguish the Examiner's proposed combination. Applicant thus formally requests a specific showing of ALL of the subject matter in ALL of the claims in any future action. Note excerpt from MPEP below.

"If the applicant traverses such an [Official Notice] assertion the examiner should cite a reference in support of his or her position." See MPEP 2144.03.

Still yet, it is noted that the Examiner application of the prior art to the remaining claims is replete with similar deficiencies. Specifically, the Examiner has rejected Claims 5, 8-12, 14, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dick et al., Schlossberg et al., and Fournel.

After careful inspection of the Examiner's proposed combination of references, there is simply no suggestion of the following emphasized limitations of the claims below, especially when taken in combination with the remaining claim elements:

9. The method as recited in claim 8, wherein the first type of the blocked attempts, the second type of the blocked attempts, and the third type of the blocked attempts are organized into categories.
10. The method as recited in claim 8, wherein a plurality of banned ports associated with the first type of the blocked attempts are displayed with the number of the occurrences associated therewith.
11. The method as recited in claim 8, wherein a plurality of banned IP addresses associated with the second type of the blocked attempts are displayed with the number of the occurrences associated therewith.
12. The method as recited in claim 8, wherein a plurality of banned applications associated with the third type of the blocked attempts are displayed with the number of the occurrences associated therewith.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed.Cir.1991).

Applicant respectfully asserts that at least the third element of the *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been met, since, for the reasons hereinabove, the prior art references, when combined, fail to teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Again, a

notice of allowance or a specific prior art showing of each of the foregoing claimed features, in combination with the remaining claim elements, is respectfully requested.

In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 505-5100. Applicants are enclosing a check to pay for the added claims. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1351 (Order No. NAIIP093\_02.012.01).

Respectfully submitted,  
Silicon Valley IP Group

  
Kevin J. Zilka  
Registration No. 41,429

P.O. Box 721120  
San Jose, CA 95172-1120  
408-505-5100

NAIIP093\_02.012.01

-16-